

Dear Jim,

12/8/84

Enclosed is a copy of my today's letter to Mark Lynch.

It seems once again that what I wanted to do should have been done.

Before the district court and on appeal.

In neither case would it have assured success but in both cases it would have been much better and it would have required other dishonesty to reach the predetermined conclusion.

Just one of the many examples, what I attested to and sent on the nonsearches. There is nothing in the briefing and it is bypassed in the decision.

This and the Stanton thing illustrate what I have been trying to tell you about what I've referred to as an academic approach.

You just can't assume judicial honesty or fairness and you cannot depend on law education, decisions and traditions in political cases.

As I believe I told you before, on the King remand I will ~~insist~~ insist on exposing every lie, distortion and misrepresentation as it is made or I'll not waste more of what little remains of my life in futilities created for me.

If Lawyers can't learn, I have.

I read the decision to hold us each separately responsible for the same fees and costs, or the government will get twice what it claims they were.

Now if you are at all disposed to argue against what I'm saying for the umpteenth time after having been proved correct for the umpteenth time, please give me some rational excuse for Hitchcock ignoring the Stanton case. Or virtually ignoring my affidavits and what I sent in on the nonsearches, now that you can compare with this newest atrocity.

I'm not arguing that the outcome would be different but I think that is possible and I am arguing that at the worst it would not have been this easy for those dishonest judges.

I'm not as surprised as I thought I'd be but maybe that is because I was able to walk a little longer without having to sit this morning and think that whether or not the Trental has anything to do with it I'm on to something that will make the therapy better for my circulation.

Best,

Harold